



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Government to-day is the tendency to increase the army of official pensioners and to enlarge the executive functions of government in such a way as to menace the integrity of free government by making the executive departments overshadow the legislative and, to a certain extent, the judicial departments. Departments, bureaus, and permanent commissions are increasing on every hand, and what is most disquieting to me is the fact that the Democratic party, which is supposed to be the conservator of the Jeffersonian theories, appears to be vying with the Republican party in this doubly dangerous innovation.

Quite apart from the principal objection—that is, the menace to free institutions—is the economic objection. Every department, bureau, and commission established not only increases the army of officials to be supported by the taxpayers, but invariably leads to a number of new appointments and increased expenses, incurring a vast amount of unnecessary taxation. It seems to me that we are becoming a commission-ridden people. Our city, State, and National Governments seem to be tending toward bureaucracy, with Russian and German ideals taking the place, to a great extent, of the old robust democratic theories of the elder days.

B. O. FLOWER.

BOSTON, MASS.

#### WHAT TO DO TO TREATY-BREAKERS

SIR,—The editor in the September number of *THE REVIEW*, in writing of the flagrant breaches of treaty obligations which have characterized the opening of the war, struck one hopeful note when he declared that never had the breaking of solemn obligations met with such universal disapprobation as now.

Skeptics assert that back of every agreement made between man and man or nation and nation lies force, which alone guarantees their enduring—force of law, represented by the courts, or force of arms. If a man breaks his agreement he can be arraigned, judged, and punished. If a weaker nation breaks her agreement she can be overpowered by a stronger one. But it does not often come to pass that the Lamb troubles the stream of which the Wolf will drink! And how then shall a strong nation which breaks its solemn promise to a weaker state be dealt with? Who shall arraign it before the International Bar? That is not difficult. Who shall judge it? Of judges there will be no lack. But who has the power to punish it?

Once the liege lord sat above the penalties his vassals suffered, even as his donjon towered above their huts. Once a king could do no wrong. But what king would dare slay ambassadors to-day? And now even the nations do not dwell, like the gods, on an Olympus above the law.

But where is the force which is to punish their breakings of the rules which they themselves have made and sworn to observe? *Public opinion*.

It is the Jack the Giant-killer among the ogres, slight of stature, yet invincible when it has climbed the beanstalk of publicity.

The strength of public opinion has never yet been really tested. It is newer even than wireless electrical manifestations. So far the demonstrations of its power have been so slight and as apparently uneventful as the scraping phonograph toys and the early experiments of Galvani. It has been a high-sounding term which conveyed no definite impression; yet certain

Columbuses, while waiting for queens to pawn their jewels, have peered across the oceans, sensing the majestic outlines of this vast new continent. Here they behold prophetically the birth of legions, the harvests of sustenance for armies which shall set forth to subdue ancient wrongs, proud and confident from lack of opposition.

As to this new continent of our America, streams from many lands shall flow of men who shall behold from a wider horizon, free from narrow sectionalism and jealousy, the old boundaries.

Let us see how in a small way this force of public opinion already exerts its influence. Laws are made, but public opinion enforces them. Those who govern in council and cabinet decide that certain measures are advisable, and set about the machinery to put them in motion. But Public Opinion thinks otherwise and calls out, at first quietly, then with a voice that resounds through legislative halls until perforce its call must be heeded. In the business world, public opinion goes by another name—business honesty—and the business conscience is tuned to play higher notes than those which the mere law requires. Perhaps it is in the social life that its power is most felt. A man is not prevented from beating his wife—provided he has an inclination for such exercise—by the penalty which the law may inflict upon him, but by the remarks which his next-door neighbor will make about his brutality. Most of us are far more sensitive to criticisms of our manners than of our morals. The punishment which public opinion metes out to the offender who transgresses its code may seem ridiculously inadequate—a cut, a boycott by those whose society he has shared, a back turned when a hand is held out—yet such methods have driven men to suicide. It is the punishment of Cain—the mark on the forehead and the loneliness.

Is it possible to apply such methods on a larger scale effectively? Is there anything in these general truths which can be fitted to the conduct of nations? Even in this universal turning of plowshares into swords, in this reversion from diplomatic measure to armed force to settle Heaven knows what is the question, no cannon have as yet destroyed the Peace Palace at the Hague. Foolhardy indeed would be the nation that dared demolish it and wipe out the words of hope that have been written within its walls! No! They will do no more than ignore it, forget its existence, until the day of exhaustion or victory. Then before the fields even have turned from red to green again they will remember it. Its very walls will accuse them and they will start running toward it from every side, shouting out like school-boys: "I didn't begin it!" "He was bigger than I." "He wasn't fair." "He hit before I was ready; punish him!"

And then comes the day of Public Opinion and her judgment. She has said in every language and in the code of the savage as well as that of much-vaunted culture, that solemn agreements must be kept; that he who breaks what he has sworn to uphold is an enemy of human progress. A neutral country has been invaded after reiterated promises that its neutrality should not be violated. "What have you to say for yourself?" asks Public Opinion. "It was necessary, a matter of life and death to me!" is the excuse. That is not sufficient justification answers the judge. "That road leads to Chaos. You are guilty."

Suppose, however, even this judgment pronounced, that the guilty nation were still the stronger, that all its neighbors together could not force it to its knees to apologize. What then could Public Opinion do? Listen to its verdict:

Guilty! Your penalty shall be social ostracism. Your neighbors shall not speak to you; their children shall not mate with yours; they will never sing your songs nor invite you to their feasts. A conqueror—if you have conquered—may forbid actions; he cannot control non-action or silence. You shall be sent to Coventry until you acknowledge your wrong.

Let us be practical now and see exactly how such a threat might be carried out. When war is over and conditions in Europe are fairly normal again, suppose the nations at The Hague Tribunal arraign those countries, vanquished or victor, who have broken their solemn treaties. If they have lost, their loss is the fortune of war, but not the special penalty of violation of agreements. That must be a separate punishment, one which will confront in the future any other nation which might urge the same excuse of necessity—a warning which might prevent a similar action. As in the civil courts, when for one reason or another a man's body cannot be imprisoned, he is fined. Let this penalty, then, take the form of a huge fine—millions, to be used not as a war indemnity, but to be expended in some manner for the benefit of all Europe, restocking the ravaged farms, perhaps, rebuilding hospitals, or furthering the cause of international peace. Until this sum were paid let all diplomatic amenities be suspended with the penalized country. If some form of diplomatic representation were absolutely necessary, let no civilities accompany it, no brilliant uniforms be worn, no interchange of courtesies. Let the guilty countries be boycotted commercially—an idea which Atherton Brownell has recently portrayed dramatically in his peace play, "The Unseen Empire." Let tourists abstain from traveling to their cities; let painters refuse to exhibit in their galleries, singers from singing in their operas; journalists from writing of their doings.

At first the penalized countries would laugh to scorn such a punishment, would refuse to be frightened at such mild measures, but gradually the accumulated impressions of their isolation would annoy, anger, and finally overwhelm. From every class of their society appeals to the government would flow in to pay the fine—from which their lands would also reap some benefit—that they might again be welcome at their neighbors' firesides.

Suppose this be tried.

V. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C.